



In This Issue

- IN BRIEF
- NEW COURT DECISION
- DSS NEWS
- NEW FEDERAL REGULATION
- CWD VICTIM REPORT

IN BRIEF

Rush Limbaugh the junkie - Conservative talk show host, Rush Limbaugh has been a strong advocate for drug testing of all welfare recipients as a condition of receiving welfare benefits. Now he has admitted to his addiction to narcotics. Maybe there should be a law that all conservative talk show hosts must be drug-tested before being allowed to spew hate on their shows.

Eloise Anderson is back in town- Arnold is our new Governor. Hit the internet to view his new transition team which includes Eloise Anderson, who served under Pete Wilson as State Welfare Director, originally from Wisconsin. After losing her job in Sacramento, she has been working as Director for Program for the American Family, The Claremont Institute (<http://www.ashbrook.org/events/lecture/2002/anderson.html>). She has been an advocate of "welfare deform" despite her early experience as a former recipient of Section 8 and food stamps benefits.

If Anderson does return to DSS, she will find that the top management of DSS has not changed much since she left.

NEW COURT DECISION

Sheyko v. Saenz. The new American judiciary attacks the poor again while addressing the issue of fingerprinting for CalWORKs and Food Stamp benefits.

A recent California Auditor General reports that the program wastes over \$20 million a year, however, Gray Davis wants it to continue.

In **Sheyko**, there were two (2) major issues; (1) that state regulations treated refusal as failure; and (2) that finger imaging requirements did not include photographing.

A decision rendered by California Third District Appellate Court Justices Morrison, Scotland and Kolkey and written by Justice Morrison held that there was no difference between the words "failure" and "refusal" in the **Sheyko** case.

The Department argued that the statute authorized the Department to operate a finger imaging system. To make the system effective they included a photographing requirement. DSS argued that given the fact that they were authorized to develop a "system", they do not have to limit the system to fingerprinting. Moreover, DSS stated that the statute did not prohibit DSS from imposing a new eligibility requirement, a requirement to be photographed.

This decision is an insult to any reasonable person's intelligence and is positive proof that there is no justice for the "have not's" in America. See court case at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/opinions.cgi?Courts=C>

DSS News

Quarterly Reporting - DSS has a new quarterly reporting form called QR7. The first line of the QR 7 is as follows:

"Request to Stop Benefits (If you fill in this part, sign and date the back of this form. You can reapply at anytime.)" There are some additional boxes to check to stop cash aid, Food Stamps, Medi-Cal, and State CMSP. There is nothing to prevent a dishonest county welfare worker from marking one of the boxes.

"You can reapply at any time" is a statement that can be easily misinterpreted to mean *"any time you want to get back on aid, just come back and see us and you'll magically be back on aid."* This is misleading and deceitful.

To get back on aid you must go to the welfare office and wait - sometimes an entire day - just to get an appointment. Your appointment day could mean another day spent at the county welfare office. Then you have to wait up to 45 days before you get your benefits back. Even if the applicant is homeless and foodless, they still wait 45 days or more. Often, the application is unlawfully denied. If the applicant is working, he/she may lose their job because they spend more time at the welfare office navigating the bureaucracy than at the job. But "welfare to work" is all about - keeping folks on welfare so welfare workers are guaranteed full employment.

Off course, there is no box to check on the QR7 for the person to request child care, transportation or ancillary service, because that would result in WtW participants receiving the supportive services they are entitled to - and

that does not suit welfare administrators. The mission seems to be to illegally deter people from entitlements such as child care.

New Federal Regulations

On September 25, 2003, SSA published new regulations for nonwork social security numbers. The regulations require that children over the age of 12 years have to personally appear at the local SSA office to apply for and be present for the interview to get a social security number (SSN).

The regulations also allow for the issuance of a nonwork number for persons who verify that they need the SSN to receive federal or local public assistance benefits and are legally in the United States of America. Many SSA offices force immigrants, who are eligible for a nonwork SSN, to go to INS, pay \$120, get a work permit and then apply for a SSN.

NOTE: Immigrants eligible for Cal-WORKs and participating in WtW are eligible for payment of the \$120 to get a work permit as an ancillary support service.

CWD Victim of the Week

GAIN SANCTION FOR FAILING TO COMMIT A FELONY - Ms. G. of Los Angeles County has a four year old child. GAIN wants her to attend the assessment component of the GAIN program. She has told the GAIN office several times that she has no child care. Her case is in the Palmdale office, which is Los Angeles

County GAIN Region II. This is a for profit organization known as ACS. The GAIN office has done nothing to help her find child care and has scheduled her for assessment during August of 2003 without ever addressing her child care needs. Again, she called the GAIN office and told them that she could not find child care. The county has not offered her child care. Appropriately, she did not leave her child alone at home and attend the assessment because she knew to do so would be a felony - child abandonment.

Los Angeles County, who was contributing this possible crime, would never have been charged with being an accomplice, rather she would have been prosecuted (more like persecuted) by the county had she left her child alone at home and gone to the assessment as demanded by the GAIN office.

In October of 2003, DPSS of Los Angeles County proposed to reduce Ms. G's benefits because she did not attend orientation.

When she got the notice she called the Palmdale GAIN office. She was informed that she did not have a worker and furthermore, it would take two to six weeks before a GAIN worker would be assigned to her case. At that time, she could then discuss her sanction with the new worker.

So, even if Ms. G. wanted to agree to participate, thereby curing the sanction as provided in MPP 42-721.431, she could not do so until her new worker was assigned in 2 to 6 weeks. This is in direct violation of 42-721.431.

To make matters worse, when she called the office during working hours, she got an answering machine. All in all it is a total mess - just like GAIN and DPSS expect it to be.

**• Share your VICTIM stories
with CCWRO.
We'll publish them
in our upcoming issues.**

CCWRO SERVICES FOR LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

Types of Services Offered:

**Litigation, Fair Hearing
Representation,
Consultation, Informational
Services, Research Services
& In-Depth Consultation.**

Programs Covered:

**CalWORKs, Welfare to
Work (WtW),
Food Stamps, Media Cal,
General Assistance &
Refugee/Immigrant
Eligibility**